

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CR2007-111635-001 DT

05/08/2014

HONORABLE JOSEPH KREAMER

CLERK OF THE COURT
S. Yoder
Deputy

STATE OF ARIZONA

JUAN M MARTINEZ

v.

BRYAN WAYNE HULSEY (001)

MICHAEL S REEVES
PATRICIA A HUBBARD

CAPITAL CASE MANAGER
OFFICE OF PUBLIC DEFENSE
SERVICES-CCC

FINAL TRIAL MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE

1:35 p.m.

Courtroom SCT 5B

State's Attorney:	Juan M. Martinez
Defendant's Attorney:	Michael S. Reeves and Patricia A. Hubbard
Defendant:	Present

Court Reporter, Marla Arnold, is present.

A record of the proceeding is also made by audio and/or videotape.

The Court has received a camera request for this matter. The State has no objection to the request. Defendant objects to filming of the proceedings until counsel can file a written objection.

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CR2007-111635-001 DT

05/08/2014

Pursuant to Arizona Supreme Court Rule 122, the filming of today's proceeding is allowed. The Court will revisit this issue relevant to presence of a camera during the trial.

The method of jury selection is discussed. The parties agree to a jury of 12 with six alternates.

Court and counsel confer at the bench.

Mr. Reeves objects to the presence of the video camera at these proceedings due to the prejudice to Defendant if potential jurors see him in jail stripes.

The renewed objection to the video camera is overruled.

Discussion regarding jury empanelment continues.

The trial schedule is discussed.

Argument is heard and rulings made on motions as follows:

1. The State's Motion to Preclude Defendant from Calling Prosecutor as Witness is **GRANTED**.
2. Defendant's Motion re Funding for ShotSpotter Services is **GRANTED**. The Office of Public Defense Services is ordered to pay the cost of an updated analysis from ShotSpotter as requested by the defense.
3. Defendant's Motion to Compel the State to Disclose all of the Expert Witnesses from ShotSpotter is **DENIED**. The Court will not compel the State to get the information, but the defense may make its request directly to ShotSpotter.
4. Defendant's objection to the State's Notice of Forensic Psychological Evaluation of Defendant by Jill S. Hayes, Ph.D. is **OVERRULED**. The Court finds that defense counsel do not have a right to be present at the interview nor will the Court require the interview to be recorded. Areas covered by attorney-client communication or questions about the killing are off limits.

Mr. Martinez advises that Dr. Hayes will testify in the penalty phase.

The Court is advised that the interviews of Dr. Globus and Dr. Wicks have been scheduled.

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

CR2007-111635-001 DT

05/08/2014

Discussion is held regarding jail procedures. Defendant was told that he would not be allowed to shave each day of trial. In addition, counsel have concerns about the type of restraints Defendant will be required to wear. Defense counsel are directed to file a written motion so that counsel for the jail can become involved, if necessary.

IT IS ORDERED affirming Trial on May 12, 2014 at 10:30 a.m. in this Division.

3:02 p.m. Matter concludes.

This case is eFiling eligible: <http://www.clerkofcourt.maricopa.gov/efiling/default.asp>. Attorneys are encouraged to review Supreme Court Administrative Order 2011-140 to determine their mandatory participation in eFiling through AZTurboCourt.